

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application, of which claims 2, 5, 7-8 and 10 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1, 3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,085,177 to Semple et al. (hereinafter "Semple et al.").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Semple et al. discloses a system for providing Internet access through an ATM. A local processor interfaces with the machine's internal processor to facilitate communication to the World Wide Web. A communication subsystem, e.g., a modem or data communication card, provides for direct coupling to the Internet. Internal memory stores web browsing software and users can initiate web access through commands through a user interface, e.g., a keyboard. The system further provides for controlling web access at the banking institution which owns the machine. Individuals withdrawing money, therefore, can be charged for Internet access time automatically.

The Examiner has urged that column 4, lines 47-67 teach using two processing state tables separately, that is, a normal processing state table and a WEB transaction-use processing state table.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no mention or processing state "tables" in Semple et al. The cited passage merely teaches that web browser software can be loaded out of memory 232 by keyboard 228, which also provides a normal user interface to ATM transactions.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/776,858  
Response to Office Action dated December 2, 2004

There is no disclosure in Semple et al. of "a WEB transaction-use processing state table which enhances the normal processing state table and which stipulates a WEB transaction carried out by the WWW by the same specifications as the normal processing state table", as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Claim 10 has been amended to recite this distinction.

Thus, the 35 USC §102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 4-9 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Semple et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,505,178 to Flenley (hereinafter "Flenley").

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Flenley has been cited for teaching that the WEB transaction processing unit transmits information obtained in the normal transaction to the WEB server to which the accessing is made but, like Semple et al., fails to teach, mention or suggest the features recited in claim 1, from which these claims depend.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-10, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **09/776,858**  
Response to Office Action dated December 2, 2004

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

*Will L. Brooks*

William L. Brooks  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla  
Atty. Docket No. **010118**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\letitia\WLB\01\010118\amendment feb 2005